



M E M O R A N D U M

TO: ACADEMIC SENATORS
FROM: Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary
SUBJ: **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**
DATE: Thursday, April 21, 2022, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom: <https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/81231074627?pwd=ZWFzZVpKVENOY2pEb0drdC8vaE43dz09>
Meeting ID: 812 3107 4627 Passcode: 761594

PRESENT: Adamian, Allen, Bailey, Boura, Boyd, Buffardi, Burk, Cline, Ferrari, Ford, Geier, Gray, Hidalgo, (Sparks), Irish, Jenkins, Kaiser, Kralj (Walter), Lawrence, McBride-Praetorius, McKee, Medic, Millard, Miller M., Monet, Musvosvi, Newell, O'Conner, Ormond, Paiva (Chair), Peterson, Rios, Seipel, Sendze, Sherman N., Sistrunk, Snyder, Son, Trailer, and Young.

ABSENT: Hutchinson, Larson, and Sherman A..

Chair Paiva called a meeting to order at 2:33 pm.

1. Approve Minutes of [March 24, 2022](#)
Minutes from March 24th approved.
2. Approve Agenda
Agenda approved.
3. Announcements
 - a. WildCat Day on the Farm event is on Friday April 22, 2022 10 am – 3 pm with guided farm tours, games and prizes.
 - b. Spring musical at Laxson auditorium will be in person. Opening day is May 5th; there will be several plays. Musical comedy based on a movie from 2001 Legally Blonde.
<https://csuchicoboxoffice.secure.force.com/ticket/#/events/a0S4P000009dLD4UAM>
 - c. Announcement to start next two Academic Senate meetings on May 5th and 12th to begin at 2 pm with no voting items (reports) covered before 2:30 pm. No objections.
 - d. Running a crowdfunding campaign to support veteran scholarship in in honor of Mike Guzzi. Recommended to donate.
 - e. Suggestion: considering role Mike Guzzi had on campus in last five years there should be an official campus wide communication about his departure.
4. University Reports – Hutchinson/Larson/Sherman/Boura/Rios/Sendze

VP Boura:

- a. University Advancement is engaging alumni and benefactors to support campus.
- b. Since fiscal year started on July 1st campus raised \$15.7 million.
- c. Tower Society program has been very successful bringing philanthropic support for the campus. Benefactors are recognized by the group.
- d. This year 551 members from the Recognition club donated \$8.3 million, last year \$4 million. Contributions continue to increase. Ten years ago, same group had 146 members and donated \$49,000.
- e. Campus created a habit of engagement.
- f. Alumni engagement office is providing different webinar series expertise and educational materials to students and benefactors. Examples: mental health, cryptocurrency, woman philanthropy program.
- g. State of the College webinars will be presented between now and July.

VP Rios:

- a. Anita Barker, Athletic Director, shared information about student athletes.
- b. Two questions asked: Do competitive sports make students successful academically or they are competitive by nature? What are the environmental elements within academics that contribute to student academic success?
- c. In last three years 330-360 students participated in intercollegiate athletics out of which a range of 60-70% students had GPA 3.0+.
- d. 30% of Hispanic and African-American students were performing academically equal to their non-underrepresented minority peers.
- e. Programs like TRIO, MESA engineering are helping students scale down physical and emotional effects, and are helping them create connections and relationships.
- f. Coaches, trainers, and staff put high expectations on academic performance for NCAA members (e.g. to have a certain GPA).
- g. Currently 21.7% (73 out of 335) of our students are student athletes are Hispanic. 18 will graduate this year.
- h. Settings that provide personal academic and social support create better learners, leaders, personal professional development, and understanding careers readiness.
- i. The athletic program is very intentional about our mission to provide broad-based, competitive NCAA division 2 program that values the student athlete experience, meaning academic success, leadership, cultural sensitivity and understanding and career readiness.
- j. Support is provided from freshmen all the way to graduation period. Athletics group celebrate academic success, athletic achievement, and engagement in campus community.

5. [Associated Students Report](#) – Young/Lawrence

Senator Lawrence provided updates:

- a. Associated Students elections have concluded with new officers being introduced, and positions being transitioned.

- b. On May 5th official transition will occur; old representatives will share roles, duties, and responsibilities with new members.
 - c. Student Academic Senate passed resolution to increase student representation on the Academic Senate.
6. Staff Council [Report](#) – Peterson
Peterson provided updates in attached report.

7. Standing Committees Reports

- [Educational Policies and Programs Committee](#) – Kralj
 - [Faculty and Student Policies Committee](#) – Sistrunk
 - [Committee on Committees](#) – Allen
 - [Executive Committee](#) – Medic
- a. EPPC will have two items today and if passed six items at next Senate meeting.
 - b. All FASP items will be presented today.
 - c. Campus invite was sent to faculty of all ranks to participate in the university's shared governance process. Committee volunteer form: <https://forms.gle/scCDrXXJeU4ZiZW78>
 - d. EC had three meetings since last Senate meeting.
 - e. Reports attached. No questions.

8. Statewide Academic Senate Report – Ford/Boyd [CSU Academic Senate](#)

- ASCSU [Agendas](#), [Minutes](#), [Resolutions](#), [March First Readings](#) and [March First Readings Summary](#), & [Summaries](#)

Statewide senators Boyd and Ford provided updates:

- a. Next plenary will be in mid-May.
- b. Interim committee meetings will be held tomorrow; first readings are linked to the agenda. Provide feedback to Statewide Senators Ford and Boyd.
- c. It was explained that in some cases there is a waiver of the rule and passing to the second read. This doesn't allow much of a time for feedback. Important to receive feedback on a first read to be able to properly respond. Encouraged senators to provide feedback.

Question: Information received that UC is trying to control the content of the ethnic studies class for high schools. Are senators familiar with this? Answer: no. Request made to share the source and appreciation for sharing this information.

9. Information: [Blackboard Learn to Canvas Migration](#) – Kathy Fernandes (3:30 pm)

No objection to move time certain from 3:30 to earlier time.

Kathy Fernandes, Academic Technology Officer, introduced migration from Blackboard to Canvas:

- a. The Governor provided \$2 million to support the migration from BlackBoard to Canvas for seven remaining CSU campuses. This was shared in December.
- b. In January campuses started planning transition process. Website (link above) provides visual.

- c. Planning phase was completed, now is configuration phase. Preparations and building a team for transition are ongoing including integration of PeopleSoft, duo authentication and others.
- d. Canvas has different features than Bb.
- e. Plan to have 20-30 faculty, limited number, representing all colleges and multiple disciplines to teach in fall using Canvas. Understand there are faculty who have technical expertise as they taught in Canvas before. Announcement will be shared soon.
- f. Transition of material is planned (e.g. quizzes, pages, modules), and collecting a feedback from first migration group. Then larger migration is planned for Spring 2023 for faculty as an open invitation.
- g. Remaining faculty will migrate in Fall 2023 and finally Spring 2024 will be to dismantle BlackBoard and use only Canvas.
- h. Last six months Bb will keep information e.g. to have record of incompletes. Bb is paid and licensed.
- i. Canvas Day will be on May 11th done in hybrid form showing Canvas demo and having topical sessions e.g. how to migrate content, assessments.

Question: Will there be a problem to have SFOTs in new LMS? Answer: This will be done in summer as part of integration process. 20-30 faculty that will be testing Canvas in fall will be first to use their evaluations in a new LMS.

Question: Will faculty have control over when they can open/close the SFOTs? Answer: in Bb faculty has a choice to show it. In Canvas there are different features. Details not looked yet, assumption it will work the same way as in Bb.

10. Proposed Resolution: [California State University Chico Academic Senate Opposition of the Second Read of Academic Senate of the California State University Resolution AS3530-22/APEP/AA](#) – Action Vice Chair Allen will take over the meeting, Secretary Medic will be able to recognize any speaker, Chair Paiva will introduce item 10:
- a. This resolution is brought forward as an action item in response to the ASCSU, requesting feedback regarding AB 928 from each campus.
 - b. Instead of waiting for the deadline, ASCSU passed a resolution with specific position on AS 928.
 - c. This resolution is in opposition to the ASCSU second read passed and process involved.

Discussion:

- a. Support for this resolution shared as this allows us to look at the Senate processes everywhere.
- b. Waiving rule should be more considerate, especially in this case moving to a second read during the same meeting before deadline for the feedback. Support shared.
- c. Most campuses were in support of core competencies.
- d. This resolution is about the process and not content. Process was not followed and was disrespected.
- e. Statewide Senators didn't get enough time to collect feedback and appropriately respond.

- f. Processes will be looked at as well as transparency without attacking the content of the resolution.
- g. Appreciation shared for bringing this forward and providing the chance for voices to be heard.
- h. A1 oral communication is the only core competency not included in the UC transfer pathway.
- i. It was confirmed that ICASS representatives shared with ASCSU it is important to protect oral communication and that ASCSU should take a formal action. Vote was unanimously supported.
- j. Clarification made to separate conversation. Vote here is on a resolution that questions the process that the ASCSU followed no matter what topic was. ASCSU is the highest entity that safeguards shared governance and they failed to do so.
- k. This represents a message to ASCSU to respect and consider the feedback of their constituents.
- l. It was clarified that by voting for this resolution, doesn't mean that member is against golden four nor oral communication. It's a vote on a process.
- m. Concern shared that ASCSU unanimously supported this when Chico State responses clearly are showing there was no unanimous support for oral communication and golden four.
- n. This resolution is a tangible way in which Statewide Senators can ask for more transparency and to improve the process.
- o. During the ASCSU meeting no one questioned timeline and breaking the same. That was seen later, and this resolution is response to that.
- p. Response from Chico State shared support but also no opposition to the Golden four.
- q. Shared that it was not fair to move forward when the deadline was at the end of March and plenary meeting was in the middle of March. Vote was pre-mature considering there was a clear deadline for response.

Senate voted on item 10: 32 yes, 3 opposed. Resolution passes.

11. Proposed Amendments to Academic Senate [Constitution](#) – EC Action

Chair Paiva introduced item 11:

- a. Item was brought to the Academic Senate in March from EC.
- b. Request was made to include a wider pool of members.
- c. Ad Hoc Committee haven't met since then.
- d. Motion made to postpone this item until next Senate meeting on May 5th. Second.

Question: What was the reason for postponement? Answer: Need more time to get feedback from a broader scope of participants.

Question: Will postponement happen before the end of a semester? Answer: yes, May 5th.

Question: Was there any progress done in past three weeks? Answer: committee haven't met. Chair Paiva will send an email asking for more participants to be involved.

Discussion on the motion:

- a. Support shared for postponement to allow to address the issues from a previous meeting.
- b. Student senators provided additional feedback in last three weeks.

- c. Clarified that second reason for postponement was to include more members outside of the Senate.

Senators voted: 28 yes, 3 opposed, motion passes. Item 11 will be postponed until May 5th.

12. Proposed Amendments to Academic Senate [Bylaws](#) – EC Action

Motion made to postpone the item 12 to allow more time to work on Bylaws until May 5th. Second.

Discussion on the motion:

- a. Constitution and Bylaws are connected, changing one will change the other. Should these two be considered as a single item?
- b. It has been clarified that these two items were separated at the last Senate meeting to be discussed separately.

Senators voted: 30 yes, zero opposed, motion passes. Item 12 will be postponed until May 5th.

Chair Paiva continued the meeting.

13. Proposed Revision of [FPPP 2.0](#) (Non-Discrimination) – FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 13:

- a. Originally there was a list of protected categories. CFA added another protected category that CSU wanted to include.
- b. FASP worked on a statement that included broader spectrum of protected categories like prohibiting discrimination, harassment, sexual misconduct, sexual exploitation, dating, domestic violence, stalking and retaliation.

Question: There is a repetition “all students and employees have a right to”? Answer: that was the original text from 2.3 that was kept.

- c. Concern shared that harassment represent the pregnancy, childbirth, and breastfeeding, and they can be more exclusive issues. That language was stricken.
- d. It was clarified that this was done based on a response from OPAL and HR who stated this language can’t be used. Per default language from EO was used as a compromise.
- e. Support shared to see that language back in the text.
- f. These are critical factors and should be recognized.

No objections, item 13 passes as an introduction item and will be in Senate on May 5th.

14. Proposed Revision of [FPPP Definitions, 7.1, 8.0., 9.0, 10.3, 11.0, 14.0](#) (Union Service) – FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 14:

- a. This is the original start of FPPP.
- b. Union service to be recognized and to count within department/college.
- c. Recently two outstanding faculty awards were given to faculty that mentioned union service as one of their responsibilities.

- d. Any disciplinary area action taken can have representation of the CFA.

No objections, item 14 passes as an introduction item and will be in Senate on May 5th.

15. Proposed [EM 22-XXX Course Cross Listing Policy](#) – EPPC Introduction

EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 15:

- a. EPPC Ad Hoc Subcommittee worked on a new EM regarding cross-listed courses.
- b. Clean and track changes copies are attached.
- c. It was approved with no opposition.
- d. Discussion included conversation on dissolution of cross-listed agreements. There is an appeal process that can be followed if this occurs.

Question: Page 2 cross listed courses cannot be crossed across levels 100 with 200; graduate courses cannot be crossed with undergraduate courses. Does this statement need to be here? Graduate students can count 400 level work as a part of graduate degree. Answer: There is nothing stopping grad student to take 400 and 600 level courses. The cross-listing is a course listed in both departments, and taught in both departments by faculty, essentially sharing same number. Second sentence is redundant, but that question is asked frequently, and this provides more clarity. Suggestion to add an example next to definition of cross-listed courses e.g. acronyms of cross listed courses.

No objections, item 15 passes as an introduction item and will be in Senate on May 5th.

16. Proposed Revision of EM 76-15 & EM 80-5 Academic Organization Policy – EPPC Introduction

- [Track](#) Changes and [Clean](#) Version
- [Academic Reorganization Request Template](#) (Appendix)

EPPC Chair Kralj introduced item 16:

- a. Charged received to look old EMs, create Ad Hoc Committee to clarify the process in terms of reorganization and how it goes through full Senate process.

No objections, item 16 passes as an introduction item and will be in Senate on May 5th.

17. Proposed Revision of [FPPP Definitions Full-time and Part-time Lecturers](#) – FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 17:

- a. Intention to address lecturer's work in FPPP and make sure definitions of full-time and part-time lecturers are clear.

Question: Why inclusion of the part at the end as it seems repetitive? The definition of the full-time lecturer is 30 WTU and 1.0 full time position. In addition, 1.0 was never defined. Answer: for more clarity. 1.0 was part of the original language copied from part-time lecturer area. The weighted teaching units was added to add a clarifying equivalence with WTUs. The attempt was to define what the 1.0 was in the terminology of weighted teaching units. Not many are familiar with 1.0 and that full time represent 30 WTU per year or 15 WTUs per each semester. 1.0 not necessarily means 12 months contract. Therefore, definition focused to clarify that.

No objections, item 17 passes as an introduction item and will be in Senate on May 5th.

18. Proposed Revision of [EM: 19-033 Campus Sustainability Committee](#) – FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 18:

- a. Committee was charged to work on achieving climate neutrality, zero waste and other University goals.
- b. Updates made to names of ex-officio members, titles and voting appointments.
- c. The Director of Energy and Sustainability used to be called this campus sustainability manager.
- d. Subcommittees, 10 of them, worked on different categories of sustainability.

Suggestion made to change on page 2, under membership #9 General Education Sustainability Pathway coordinator, pathway has been renamed to Sustainability and Climate Change.

Question: what is current process for green leaf approval? Answer: Green leaf is in the catalog.

Process: each department self-identify their courses and designate green leaf.

Support shared for keeping the green leaf symbol as that makes Chico State unique.

No objections, item 18 passes as an introduction item and will be in Senate on May 5th.

19. Proposed Revision of [FPPP Definitions; 5.1.3a-f; 5.1.3l-m](#) (Hiring Committees) – FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 19:

- a. Language clean-up on hiring, especially hiring tenure track faculty.
- b. Brian Oppy from OPAL provided changes as well.
- c. Clarifying terminology and definitions.

No objections, item 19 passes as an introduction item and will be in Senate on May 5th.

20. Proposed Revision of [FPPP Definitions; 1.0; 1.1; 5.1; 5.1.1; 5.1.1.e; 5.2; 5.2.1.a-c; 5.2.5; 5.2.5.a-d; 5.2.6.a-d; 12.0; 12.1; 12.1.2](#) (Lecturer Issues) – FASP Introduction

FASP Chair Sistrunk introduced item 20:

- a. All these FPPP changes deal with lecturer work, current practice about lecturers, range elevation, what range to hire lecturer at, salary schedule.
- b. Lecturers with the same amount of service can be paid differently across the different colleges.
- c. Determination of a position and range at which lecturers can be hired.

Discussion:

- a. Appreciation shared for working on this document and changes.
- b. Section 5.2.5 university appointment standards for lecture ranges, under range A2 “the individual must demonstrate currency through professional activity”. Other ranges mentioned “currency in the field”. Not clear why there was a difference.
- c. Stated that educational standards for B3, C4, and D5 are the same.
- d. Responsibility section for C and D ranges look the same.
- e. Response was that CBA described ranges in a way that person with a terminal degree should be hired at range B. Question is how lecturers move to range C, next range, when contract is not requiring to get a higher degree. This can be a cause for promotion, increase in salary. It is work in the field, service, demonstration of professional competencies in the field. Time and service is the difference between ranges. Other parts of FPPP discuss how to get range elevation.
- f. Time in service and salary step increases move lecturer within a single range.
- g. Salary step increases are only awarded through negotiations between the CFA and the CSU.
- h. Range B responsibility includes teaching courses at multiple levels (lower and upper); ranges C and D do not have similar language and appears to be a lower standard than range B.

- i. Appointment section is not clear on if a lecturer with a doctoral degree should be hired at range B, C or D. Initial appointment isn't common at associate or professor level.
- j. It is not common to hire lecturers at the initial appointment at levels C and D. This is a practice across the CSU.
- k. It is hard to have a full appointment as a lecturer, this is not a common practice at Chico State.
- l. Moving between ranges takes a long time, especially if lecturer is not a full-time lecturer.
- m. Raises are received through negotiation, CO refused to give raises for seven years.
- n. Grateful for FASP and Senator Sistrunk's work on this as it is important to provide more information on range elevation and the process involved.

Question: What does it mean "corresponds to assistant professor, associate professor, professor"? Duties, responsibilities, and expectations for lecturers are different. Answer: previous definitions included these terms and equivalents. It relates to salary schedule.

- o. Support for placing lecturer at the appropriate range is shared at the initial hiring.
- p. Developing course between ranges B, C, and D is not consistent.
- q. CFA website had a table with lecturer ranges and professor levels. There were listed, not described. That may be original reason for mentioning professor.
- r. Concern shared that Chairs should not expect lecturers to perform professor's responsibilities. In that case, lecturers will never receive range elevation. This should not be misinterpreted.
- s. Tenure track promotions are compared to lecture range elevations in document mentioned above; they are not having same expectations nor responsibilities. Link shared by Senator in item 24 others (<https://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/assets/documents/unit-3-salaries-at-a-glance-2021-22.pdf>).

No objections, item 20 passes as an introduction item and will be in Senate on May 5th.

21. Proposed Revision of EM: [11-045 Campus Fee Advisory Committee](#) – FASP Introduction
Jennifer Underwood, FASP member, introduced item 21:

- a. CFAC was charged by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate with determining the efficiency and effectiveness of the current IRA advisory committee structure.
- b. Revisions incorporated in document above.
- c. Summary of revisions reference most recent EO1102 California State student fee policy by promoting student voice in fee related decisions and supporting meaningful consultation on campus.
- d. Establish CFAC subcommittee made of CFAC members to oversee IRA and student learning fee processes. Student learning fees are already under the purview of CFAC; adding IRA as well.
- e. Maintain student voting majority membership with at least one faculty member.
- f. Proposing establishment of unit level committees. College level committees to be established would maintain a student voting majority where IRA proposes would be submitted to the relevant unit.

Discussion:

- a. Praises shared for work done on this document.
- b. Membership section included language from a prior version that student appointment is done by the Associated Student President. There are students appointed by the Student Academic Senate. Suggestion to have At-Large student members and/or Student Academic Senator to avoid conflict of interest.
- c. Student Senator supported the suggestion above.

No objections, item 21 passes as an introduction item and will be in Senate on May 5th.

22. Information: [Academic Senate Officer Nominations](#)

- Chair – [Academic Senate](#)
- Vice Chair – [Academic Senate](#)
- Secretary – [Academic Senate](#)
- Chair - [Educational Policies and Programs Committee](#)
- Chair - [Faculty and Student Policies Committee](#)

Chair Paiva introduced open AS officers positions:

- a. The Academic Senate officer nominations will be open today (see detail descriptions above).
- b. Senate Officers positions come with a buyout option.
- c. Nominations will be due at least five days before the election. Formal email will be sent tomorrow.

23. Ask the Administrator

24. Other

Discussion:

- a. Reminder to contribute to the Constitution and Bylaws feedback.
- b. Students are not able to vote for FPPP items (faculty vote only). Ask to include within Bylaws that those items are pushed further towards the end of a meeting recognizing that portion of membership can't contribute to this.
- c. Response: student voice is important and valued with FPPP items. Even if students can't vote for them, students can contribute to the discussion and share their perspectives.
- d. Student Senator response: FPPP is important for faculty, their job and work conditions; this may be regulated by a different policy but supporting them is important. This does not discriminate students.
- e. Presence of all members and their participation in shared governance is important. Losing members in a meeting means losing potentially quorum and not being able to pass important policies, resolutions, EMs.
- f. Support shared by a staff senator who also can't vote for FPPP item but is interested in finding out about faculty policy changes and how they impact faculty, students, staff, and campus. It is not only about voting, but also the process of shared governance.
- g. Senator shared a document that can clarify use of "assistant professor", "associate professor", and "full professor" in lecturer range elevation descriptions (previously discussed item 20).
<https://www.csuchico.edu/oapl/assets/documents/unit-3-salaries-at-a-glance-2021-22.pdf>

25. Adjourn at 5:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ana Medic, Academic Senate Secretary